NEW CHRISTIAN

SEPT.-OCT. 1957 EDITED BY KENNETH LESLIE

OUR WAR WITH OURSELVES

By James L. Brewer

SCIENCE AND THE UNITIVE LIFE

PARTISANS OF MAN

☆ ★ ☆

Vol. XII, No. 11 30 cents

A WAR TO WIN WITH OURSELVES

By James L. Brewer

In retrospect it is becoming strikingly apparent that the famous Krushchev TV interview was a major event for all who desire a relaxation of international tension. Its organization turned out to be a significant public service on the part of the broadcasting system.

It must have forced wide recognition of the fact that Krushchev had emerged as a human being with vital assurances to the American audience of a non-aggressive policy toward the U.S. He asked for a competition of social systems, that system having the support of the people to prevail *by historical verdict.* No appeal could more definitely quicken American ears than this terse plea, "We want peace and friendship to alleviate the burden of taxation and insure switch to useful production."

Remarkable, indeed, has been the reception of the Krushchev proposals in such unexpected quarters as Democratic senate leader Lyndon Johnson's suggestion of US-USSR "open curtain" cultural exchanges.

Further hope for an upward turn in peace prospects is furnished in the reassurances by George F. Kennan, the noted "Mr. X", former planning theoretician of the State Department, that to his knowledge the Kremlin leaders do not want war. Kennan had previously minimized the danger from communists and communism, warning against "a more real danger within ourselves that we may become no longer like the persons who founded the Republic."

Still more relaxation of cold war tensions may be envisioned in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court modifying civil liberty constrictions under which sweeping penal convictions of communists and others as subversive toward the American order of Government have taken place. The high court in effect has disapproved of congressional committee procedures for perverting the legitimate legislative purpose of inquiry to inquisitional gravity as unconstitutional violation of the individual's liberties. The gravamen of the ruling was that, in order to combat the communist movement, it is not permissible to proceed outside the constitution.

Prof. H. H. Wilson of Princeton University, analyzing the anti-democratic phenomenon of "McCarthyism," declared that a change in the climate of American opinion was essential to a return of American free institutions to their place of authority. The recent Supreme Court contribution recalls the dissenting opinion of Judge Hugo Black in the first Smith Act convictions:

"Public opinion being what it now is few will protest the conviction of these communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that, in calmer times, when pressures, passions and fears subside, this, or some later court, will restore the first amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society."

Most revealing in the peace struggle have been the disclosures of a momentous conflict concerning a cut in arms expenditure.

A group of intransigent anti-Russians and their political allies arrayed with Admiral Radford, Chief of Staff, in stark opposition to the trend of Eisenhower-Stassen conciliatory explorations, are greatly worried over the effect of the disarmament talk on the will of the legislators to cut the military budget.

Commenting on the fear that if the war tensions are relaxed the advantages will go to the Communist powers, the disadvantages to the non-communist, Walter Lippmann asks: "Is this our true measure of the world? Must we really believe that with less fear and anxiety and tension we shall languish while the totalitarian states will flourish? Surely this assumption which turns our moral conviction upside down is itself a morbid symptom of the existing tensions, manifesting itself in a profound lack of confidence in our own people."

Specification of the chaos of military waste in a Mahon concongressional sub-committee report recites "that about 30 percent of defense spending is excessive, is causing inflation, provides no real defense, and by being built into our domestic economy constitutes a real threat to the nation." Member of the committee, James L. Whitten, a conservative Mississippi Democrat, making this special comment, said conversations he had held during a Russian visit led him to believe that the Russian menace had been built up here beyond all reasonable proportions in order to scare up higher military appropriations.

Congressman Whitten pleads for the transference of the 30 percent military waste to vital work of civic improvement, in that way giving real substance to the present national prosperity facade that would collapse without the false stimulation of the arms prodigality.

The Washington journalist, I. F. Stone, sees in the fight over the military budget a fight for peace, the military being out to heighten tension in order to maintain political control and high spending at home.

The reputed labor and A.D.A. political libertarians are taxed with uncritically supporting the president's budget of swollen military estimates, in express acquiescent avowal that "the security needs of the United States must be met despite the cost." "This is a tragic question-begging as to real security needs," says Stone, asking "Are the country's economy and fate being unsoundly tied to an arms race chimera which can lead only to military domination, or perhaps to war, a normal first concern for labor and liberal leaders? How can there be adequate expenditures in the field of social welfare if the military are allowed a blank check?"

It is a melancholy day for American liberalism, Stone is further prompted to say "when its leading spokesmen act as a sounding board for the 3/5th-take military budget makers on a

factitious security scale in despite of costs. Their silence today reflects the vast and inhibiting shadow cast across American life by the sheer size of the military budget. Labor as well as capital now depends upon it, and labor leaders, too, would rather acquiesce in the arms race than risk unemployment. The colleges and a whole strata of intellectuals live off the search for even more ingenious weapons. The race for the ultimate destroyer has created a market for brains. Mathematicians and physicists are at a premium. The intellectualists like the capitalists and the labor leaders are loath to bite the hand that feeds them."

A challenging moral appeal for termination of the world crisis of menacing military armament extinction has come from the Protestant churches of Czechoslovakia through their eminent leader, Dr. J. L. Hromadka: "We appeal again for the cold war to be stopped and for the Western world to take account of the existence of the Socialist States in order to overcome the sterile and disruptive anti-Soviet and anti-Communist spirit by one of understanding and cooperation. Only in that way can shortcomings on all sides be dealt with. Only in this way can human liberties and rights be achieved on a new historical basis."

The Importance of Public Enlightment:

The public must not be denied enlightenment as to the great American dilemma of the artificial inherency of its war-economy prosperity with its fateful implications of approaching bankruptcy, maintained under the baleful pressures of the military establishment fostering the mad power race. Not the less horrifying is the perverted public acquiescence promoted by a craven dereliction of moral responsibility on the part of the national cultural leadership. In broad aspects, spiritual, intellectual, labor-shared and reputedly politically progressive, our people are succumbing to government foreign policy pretenses of the necessity of voracious munition-fed juggernautic preparations for God-mocking nuclear war.

In the midst of well-authenticated evidence of the dawn of new world stability in the unfoldment of international events of transcendent significance, setting the world agog, the widespread degradation of journalistic integrity is appalling.

A fury of veritable gutter squalor reached a peak in a recent cartoon of the world-astounding New China in the guise of a skunk approaching forlornly in evident appeal for American recognition the tightly-shut portals of Uncle Sam's official residence.

It would indeed seem a time of urgency for a public taking-of-stock of the extraordinary, irresponsible domination of the vast majority of American communities in the mass communication field, by the super-power press of single-track monopoly sway: a truly totalitarian genius, its editorial pattern imposing a sweeping single-party treatment upon the political thinking of the reading public.

Dedicated peace promoters will fervently hail the recent resounding challenge to the prevailing U.S. foreign policy in the stirring indictment on the floor of the Senate by the clear-minded Democratic party Senate whip, Mike Mansfield, imputing sheer bankruptcy to it; the guidance of Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, termed "a hodge podge of sterile slogans and fumbling fears"; the national administration accused of relying on stimulated fear of blown-up Soviet "threat" to justify its foreign policy actions in excuse for skyrocketing of military expenditures and high taxes.

The senator graphically proclaimed the need to explore the whole scope of relations with the Soviet Union and recommended that Secretary Dulles, himself, go to Russia, with a view to lessening the threat and danger of nuclear war.

With rare eloquence Mansfield clinches his accusation, saying: "This so-called peace is no peace at all, but a desperate clinging by the finger tips to survival." "It is," he said, "a tortured dance of diplomacy on the edge of the abyss."

This has been only too well revealed in Dulles' own confession of "brinkmanship."

Walter Lippmann would today apprehend despair of reality in Dulles' proposed new approach to disarmament as couched wholly in the logic of technical procedure, and "not embodying a viable logic of statesmanship in the real world."

"Who says America is a saint and Russia a sinner?" asks the Rev. Dr. David Wesley Soper, and he answers, "Americans. Even Europeans are a little doubtful. To what are we trying to convert Russia— our national self-righteousness, our American mediocrity?"

Surely in the growing American consciousness of national social blight incident to democracy running to fat we must perforce awaken to the full realization that in the chaos of today's world war challengings, we of America have a war to win with ourselves.

SCIENCE AND THE UNITIVE LIFE

Comment on Bronowski's *Science and Human Values*

At the end of 1956 in an eloquently persuasive essay in the *Nation* J. Bronowski, the British scientist and critic, presented a conception of science so broad that it included ethics and poetry. "The values of science have grown out of the practice of science because they are the inescapable conditions for its practice," he said.

"Science is the creation of concepts and their exploration in the facts. It has no other test of the concept than its empirical truth to fact. Truth is the drive at the center of science; it must

have the habit of truth, not as a dogma, but as a process. Consider then, step by step, what kind of society scientists have been compelled to form in this single pursuit. If truth is to be found, not given, and if therefore it is to be tested in action, what other conditions (and with them, what other values) grow of themselves from this?"

The "other conditions" he discovers are independence, originality, and therefore, dissent. "Dissent is the native activity of the scientist."

Bronowski calls the Middle Ages "that servile and bloody world" which "upheld neither independence nor tolerance . . ."

But the cause of the blood *was* dissent. There was plenty of dissent in the Middle Ages and throughout the Christian era and most of it was Christian dissent terrorized and literally burned out of the social body by an imperial church. Moreover it was, properly speaking, far from un-or anti-scientific dissent; for it was the dissent of those who sought wholeness as truth. The Roman power, Christian in name, ruthlessly destroyed these seekers, Christians in truth. Their blood and ashes fertilize Europe. And it was among these Christians, true followers of him who said the truth shall make you free, that we find such men as Gerrard Winstanley the Digger who preached a modern view of science as a corollary of "the truth as Jesus Christ spake it." "Both Winstanley and the early Fellows of the Royal Society, good puritans, gave as their conscious motive (for scientific study) the study of the works of God." (Joseph Needham, *Time: the Refreshing River*, London, 1948.)

Free enquiry, free thought, free speech, tolerance are safeguards which must protect independence. In a scientific society, says Bronowski, all these are self-evident.

Two-way Application:

But the practice of trade and commerce requires similar safeguards. All these virtues are means to an end. True, science is a school of honor. But war too is a science. All kinds of purposes, good or ill, can be carried out scientifically. There is science in safe-cracking and a kind of honor among safe-crackers. The question of what purpose to pursue cannot be arrived at through science, even though in choosing a purpose we have due regard for scientific possibilities.

People speak of applied science as if it were a sort of downgraded pure science. But science when applied by men to achieve human ends becomes the instrument of human integrity. By the same token when applied as in Hidoshima it is an instrument of degradation, through no fault of science itself and not because it is applied but because it is applied to defeat human ends.

Let us remind ourselves that the human end taught, lived, and inspired by Jesus is world community in goods through world communion in spirit. Now, the question arises: is this truth or

dogma? Jesus set it forth as truth. His parables and his deeds were instruments plunged into the test-tube of life as indicators of this truth. His reactions to the immediate confrontations of life's demands and problems were, subject to historical limitations, the same as those of a modern creative restorer of men's bodily and mental health both social and individual. His was the applied science of the artist in living.

When science comes to be applied it implies a consideration of the purpose to be served by the application and, further, it becomes science plus. The plus is art.

The Human Dare:

Quoting Schweitzer against mysticism, and having shown, as he claims, that "the human values are rationally derived," Bronowski adds, "Those who crusade against the rational and receive their values by mystic inspiration have no claim to these values of the mind."

But what of that mysticism which embraces reason and whose very reason-for-being is that it undergirds and provides a foundation for reason. You may say, why does reason need a foundation? Won't it stand by itself? Why embarrass it with a mystique? My answer is that otherwise you will be embarrassing it with a metaphysics which is in turn another exercise of the reason. It is precisely because I want to leave the discursive reason free to do its work that I insist on making this one claim (as to the validity of reason) depend on a *human dare*, unsupported by reason but supporting reason. This dare, this venture, is a push *beyond* what is known, in order to "validate" the knowing process. It is a push of the whole personality and is propelled by the emotions, particularly by the *desire* for unity, the longing for identification with that of which we are obviously a connected part.

The freedoms (of thought, enquiry, speech) and independence are, says Bronowski, self-evident in a scientific society, "logical needs where men are committed to explore the truth." They would be if the scientific society could operate in a vacuum. But science tends to subserve what the general society serves.

Bronowski defines science as "the organization of our knowledge in such a way that it commands more of the hidden potential in nature." This appears to be a fair definition. Moreover, while "there is no sanction for confining the practice of science in this or another way" . . . "its theories have often been made by men whose imagination was directed by the uses to which their age looked" Precisely.

Today powerful societies have been in a state of latent war and consequently there has developed a vast science of destruction. The first result of atomic science was a massacre of the innocents. The science of Bacteriology, once used *against bacteria*, is now used *for the development of bacteria* and *against human beings*. No wonder scientists are disquieted when they see what is being

done with their science.

Bronowski, viewing the ruins of Nagasaki, heard a dance band playing *Is You Is or Is You Ain't My Baby?* It was this tune suggesting the question of moral responsibility that impelled him to write his essay. His conclusion would seem to be that *It Ain't Necessarily So!* In other words it is not science's fault. And it isn't; because science is an instrument and therefore not responsible.

Herbert Butterfield, who eloquently acclaims the power and glory of the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century in his "Origins of Modern Science," states that "the idea of progress represented the secularisation of an attitude, initially religious, which looked to a fine fulfillment in some future, far-off event, and saw history, therefore, as definitely leading to something." He even goes so far as to say that "at the Renaissance it was almost less possible to believe in what we call progress than it had been in the middle ages."

Thou Hast Conquered, O Gay Galilean!

When, without losing their essential nature, the attitudes of the religious world become the attitudes of the secular world we may say that the religious world has conquered the secular world. "Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilean/And the world has grown gray with Thy breath," as Swinburne expressed it. But it was not the Galilean who made the world gray; it was a spectre evoked from paganism by a paganized Christendom. The Galilean was exactly the opposite of "pale" and insofar as his breath has blown upon the grayness of the sad pagan world it has touched that world to a life full of colour and song and controversy.

One of the by-products of that breath is modern science, many of whose idolators today attribute to it a virgin birth in the seventeenth century and a sinless life in the centuries following. But other by-products which we neglect, to our peril, were the so-called Gothic cathedrals, the music of Palestrina and the Netherlands school, the songs of the Hebrides, the American, French and the Russian Revolutions.

If there is anything gray in our lives today it is science-as-an-end-in-itself. For science operates by abstraction. Even colour and sound as known to science have no meaning for the painter or singer. Theology as a science (in the sense in which geometry is a science) is like beating the odds in an adventure. If life could be rigged, and the odds in its game could be reduced to zero, would it not take away the colour of life, the sound and fury, the holy dread, the awesome choice, the venture over the surface of the deep, the faith, hope and love? Would it not substitute a cold mathematical certainty for a warm sung credo? A creed that is turned into a scientific formulation does away with the need for grace. Does this appear to put a premium on ignorance? Or carelessness? Not at all. It puts a premium on humility and humor and a sense of proportion. It is indeed part of the game to

keep on reducing the odds, yet for every certainty achieved ten new uncertainties arise.

Can science say one completely meaningful thing? Does it not, and must it not, speak only of conditions in which this or that event may transpire and apart from which that certain event may not transpire? Can it speak of any event in the fulness of its human import?

It is most obviously in music that poetry and science (mathematics), insight and order, are wed; where truth issues in rhythm and melody, warmed by its apprehension, its embrace of reality. One always feels an inadequacy, even a sort of blasphemy about prosaic comments or mathematical explanations of a piece of music by which one has been deeply moved.

Do Scientists Weep?

Science or the spirit of science is part of music, part of poetry, part of religion which is the substance of music and poetry. Science can even be said to be indispensable to all of these. For, with all due obeisance to the Scientific Revolution, science remains nothing more nor less than organized knowledge. It is vast in extent and in detail. It is a faithful instrument for the control of nature. It places each object of nature, a group of stars or a rose, into its proper pigeon-hole. It analyses and re-analyses. But it does not fall in love with the rose and weep over the death of the rose. The scientist may, but then he is more than a scientist. He has given rein to something in him which forgets for the moment the botanic particulars and loses himself in this small part of the universe which, standing outside of him, invites him in to share its life and its fate. He dies with the rose.

But more, he suffers wth his fellow human beings humiliated by forces that use them against their free will. Science *could* serve these hostile forces, these degraders of human beings. Bronowski thinks that science as a discipline is self-regulative. But even the "dissent" he posits as the native activity of the scientist would not be tolerable if it denied the truth which is the drive at the center of science. Truth remains, even if no formulation of truth can be exalted into permanency. Though all formulae are tentative, "truth" can be grasped in a living act.

The Sources of Honor:

We have no nostalgic desire for a dogmatic society, whether the dogma be that of a medieval pope or of a bureaucrat's gloss of dialectical materialism. And since there can be nothing more antipathetic to dogmatism than the parables of Jesus we believe it won't do to brush him aside when seeking the sources of our concepts of honor and mutual respect.

One may say: why worry about sources? Isn't the important thing the possession of these qualities, wherever they came from? My reply is that science itself (which assuredly has its rights) demands the ascription of these virtues to their true source. More-

over these virtues are a kind of infection. They are caught. There is an impulsion in them which makes them even more important than the conditions of scientific effort, important, indeed essential as they are for that effort. For at their heart is Christian love and the unitive life which through creative work unites the creature with the creator.

The New Christian does not seek to undermine reason in any respect. We will have no part in the "retreat from reason" so widely posted and in such respectable places these latter days. However, there is a difference between being rational and being rationalist. The reason is the orderer, the arranger of life. Immediately implied in every act of arranging there is another act, the act of evaluation. These two acts become inextricably involved with each other to the point that it becomes difficult to separate them. Yet for the sake of reason itself, that is, in the interests of clarity and order, they must be differentiated.

PARTISANS OF MAN

Why take time and space to discuss science and values when so many day-to-day problems present themselves for immediate attention? Things are moving at ever accellerated speed. The truly free world moves forward, the self-styled "free-world" hangs back and acts as a brake on progress.

The Russian discovery of the ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile) has pushed us into a situation where the hangers-back are liable at any moment to receive a severe jolt from the rear. It is not war that will jolt them; it is the mushrooming of their own along with the Russian productive power, suddenly released from the waste of piling up armaments. This productive power will spill out across the world forcing it into an era of intense growth and development. Capitalist will meet Commissar, our engineers will meet their engineers in remote corners of the globe emulating one another in pushing back the frontiers of privation and ignorance.

The breaking of the atomic monopoly was the first step and the discovery of ICBM is the final step in our arrival at this present situation.

It is still the case of the sheriff and the outlaw. Just as the outlaw knew he could kill the sheriff but also knew he would be killed himself at the same instant, so today Sam can shoot Ivan but will be shot. In Carlyle's vivid story of a "battle" there were 100 soldiers on each side and at the conclusion 200 dead soldiers. Only in this case it is 2 or 3 hundred million civilians.

Dr. Hugh Keenleyside, the Canadian who is director-general of the UN's technical assistance program, says that Canada's civil

defense planning would be a wash-out in nuclear war. "In the first onslaught most people would be killed and the others incapacitated by fall-out." In other words THERE IS NO DEFENSE. So all the money spent for defense might have been spent on public welfare, increased pensions, medical attention, improved roads, education. What goes for Canada goes for the USA.

Unless we *want to commit suicide*, we must negotiate (not from preponderant strength but from *equal strength*) with the USSR. We must reconsider and re-adjust our attitudes and our relations with every power, great and small, throughout the world. Bitter medicine, but better bitter medicine than sure death.

The night of terror and blackmail has passed. We are in the midst of a new day.

Some time may elapse of course before Washington opens its eyes to the new day. And during that interim unforeseeable things may happen. Confused men are loose in high places. They must be handled carefully lest they run amok. For, although their delusions begin to die (for instance the delusion that Formosa, or rather a small clique on Formosa, is China) some have staked their careers on these delusions and they still remain in positions of dangerous power.

Of course the biggest of all the delusions is the cold war. This will die hard; but die it must, for its premises have disappeared. Very soon notice must be served to the diplomats that it is no longer useful to ring the cold war tocsin every time they stand up to speak. They need only deal with concrete issues, with the perspectives of world history and geography in mind, addressing themselves to the task of clearing away the obstacles to mutual aid and a closer communion between peoples.

The era we are entering is the period of *emulation* referred to 12 years ago in our editorial, "Capitalist-Socialist Emulation" (*Protestant:* Feb. 1945). Referring to that article James Clement Dunn, Assistant Secretary in the US State Department, wrote "I find there is much to be said for Mr. Leslie's concept of emulation between the capitalist and socialist economies. In terms of the Soviet Union and this Country (US) I have every reason to believe that this emulation will remain a friendly competition in which the two nations will vie, with mutual confidence, in raising standards of living for our own peoples and peace-loving people everywhere."

It is well to look back to those days and to realize how far from that atmosphere of sanity we have strayed. In that same issue of the *Protestant* Boris Skomorovsky could without undue optimism "foresee an era of new dynamic democratic, and progressive regimes" in Europe. Then came Fulton, the betrayal of Greece, the consolidation of Spanish fascism, the buying of the Italian elections, the rehabilitation of the financial powers that

had backed the Nazis, the great American grab for bases all over the world, and, worst of all, the cold war and the witch hunt.

Even to the end of 1947 David Lawrence of *US News and World Report* had been attacking the Truman Doctrine and the cold war. Think how far he has wandered. Think of the sad parade of liberals doing their damnedest to conform to a crazy world.

Certain equivocations in World War II could have warned us of the stubbornness with which world imperialism would fight to keep popular regimes from power. Churchill's attack on the Greek partisans was one. His secret order to stack Nazi arms against the Russians was another. Another, reported in the *Protestant* (Feb. 1945) by a University of Chicago teacher, Renzo Bianchi, was a betrayal of such a nature as to be almost unbelievable. To quote from Bianchi: "Churchill told us early that it was necessary to keep Italy from falling into 'anarchy and chaos.' To ensure this, during the forty days which passed between the fall of Mussolini on July 25, 1943, and the signing of the first Italian armistice on September 3, British bombers engaged in repeated 'saturation' attacks on the large cities of northern Italy. During this time, correspondents repeatedly called attention to the fact that the original four German divisions in Ialy were being strengthened. Yet these bombers significantly neglected the alpine passes to Italy until September 3, when 21 divisions had already been brought in—enough Germans, that is, to keep Italy from falling into 'anarchy and chaos' during the interim of Allied unpreparedness. Of course, the Germans had to be thrown out later; for, should Germany suddenly collapse, the northern Italians would very likely present the Western Tories with the *fait accompli* of a truly democratic Italian republic. The Germans also were interested in maintaining order in Italy. Martial law was promptly declared and administered with German thoroughness and efficiency. Affairs were thus stabilized until Allied preparedness would permit the expulsion of the Germans."

Yes, "thoroughness and efficiency." The trees of Northern Italy were burdened with "strange fruit," the bodies of anti-cleric partisans. Thus the "enemy" became the "ally" in preserving the power of that political church which was to switch its wagon from the Swastika to the Stars and Stripes. If you wonder at the sudden re-appearance of the Nazi industrialists in the panoply of their former glory just look back and see that the hue and cry against the Nazis was a fraud and a hoax. If the Nazis had played ball with the Federation of British Industries and with the Du Ponts and Rockefellers, and especially if they had been willing at least to pretend to take a role inferior to the Papacy, they could have remained in power, as Franco and Salazar remain in power.

The history of crime in high places during the war and in the decade since 1945 can never be fully written, for the records

of the worst crimes have been sequestrated or destroyed. We have had no "20th Congress" in the West. However, the story will sooner or later be reconstructed from the point of view of the partisans of man. And the lessons will be underlined for the guidance of posterity.

It will try to find out how men have been manipulated and conditioned to fight for their own enslavement. History is science. History is knowledge. And there is no clearer example of how science can serve and must be made to serve a power beyond itself, the power to choose purposes. Science is knowledge of what is and has been. It can also aid in knowing what is to be *under certain conditions.* But it cannot determine the choice of the conditions and therefore the choice of the future. Men may know all things past and present and yet choose death rather than life, lust rather than love, exploitation and tyranny rather than mutual aid and democracy. Two men, or two societies, knowing the same facts will choose opposite ways of life.

It is in this realm of choice that values emerge. Men choose what they value. There is no hierarchy of values in science. The flu virus is of the same value as the flu victim in the book of science. And the mass of knowledge which afterwards is used to kill the virus is first built up in an atmosphere of value-neutrality. Then it is *used* by the partisan of human life. So with the facts of history. They must be exhumed in an atmosphere of neutrality, then used to prevent recurrences of such depravity and horror as are symbolized by Belsen, Buchenwald, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Koje, Guernica, and so on.

Thus the science of history will be used to discover what terrors, what lusts could drive men to commit the atrocious crimes of the past two decades. These crimes have been for a time more or less extinguished by the scribbling of "historians" with an interest in hiding the truth. The time is coming when, after historical science has taken note of the facts, the partisans of man will set them in the framework of their partisanship.

History as a science is still in the future. Until now every history has been written to support a thesis. The historians of a given era always attempt to make actual events conform with ideal events. Churchill is not the only case in point. Nor are these characteristics confined to capitalist historians. Every historian has large rosy coloured spectacles for certain events and is blind to events which are less favourable to his thesis. History, by whomever written, is always a rationalization, and usually a glorification, of the process by which a certain regime developed and used power. Even the greatest historical scholar of the day, Arnold J. Toynbee, a man of creative imagination, having been reared in the Victorian era of British imperialism, was unable to grasp the significance of the Russian and Chinese revolutions and so saw China and Siberia as empty spaces about which the only question

was: which empire will take them over? His guess was Japan, not a bad guess considering that with all his vast knowledge of the long story of mankind he had never met up with this strange animal, a revolution that could stabilize itself in a hostile world.

An erstwhile reader, who remains a friend, accuses us of leniency towards the Soviet government. But the Soviet government has not been lenient with itself. It has stood up before the world and accused itself of crimes against its own people and against humanity. It is indisputable that these crimes were committed. The fact that they were confessed implied (and the evidence of recent travellers bears out the implication) that honest and serious efforts are being made to prevent the possibility of such crimes being repeated. What government ever did such a thing before?

Could our government confess even a tenth of its crimes what a breeze would blow the stagnant foulness from our world.

If Truman could be brought into court to answer the questions of Fyke Farmer (who refuses to be taxed to pay for the Korean war) a hole might be opened in the dyke of misinformation which holds back the ocean of crimes for which we as a nation are responsible, from the betrayal of Spain to the rape of Guatemala.

But this will not take place until a wave of indignation and shame sweeps our people. And that is the point of our remarks about science and value. The passion for truth cannot be expressed in an equation or captured in a formula. The man who lacks that passion is not a man. The nation which lacks it is soulless. The church and the mass media which throttle that passion are murderers. That passion can only be awakened by an inward conversion, a total rebirth.

This is why the New Christian calls for a new kind of preaching, not only in churches, not even chiefly in churches, perhaps most importantly in the letters columns of our daily press. An inundation of letters is required until the publishers begin to tremble before the passionate determination of the people make the truth known. But the people must first be shocked and shamed to the roots of their being before they will rise to do their duty. As Mr. Brewer well says, "We have a war to win with ourselves."

JUSTICE IS PASSION

Those who say economics determines everything go too far. Economics *conditions* everything. It *determines* nothing. It limits choices. Within those limits it does not choose. In a wood and stone age there can be no steel buildings. Gravity and the strength of materials condition the shape and size of buildings. They do not determine them.

Moral gravity, the pull of instincts, along with the unitive pull of human kinship, conditions the shape of the social structure. But, just as men are free to choose from an infinite number of architectural forms, so social man can choose various forms of social and political life so long as the natural instincts and the passion for kinship are not violated. In our capitalist society the passion for kinship is inverted into fratricidal war, a war which eats the vitals of our society.

Why are our modern liberals so afraid of the word passion? Is it a residue of puritanism? *The Nation* (185/8), prefacing a magnificent review of the Hiss Case, says it is possible that "majority opinion, in a moment of passion, has sanctioned injustice." And "it is only as passions subside that re-appraisal of the evidence is possible."

Here justice is looked upon as a static thing, a precise balance that is disturbed by the winds of passion. But isn't there a passion for justice? Men do not move unless they are moved from within. This is the central truth of religion.

Our editor should have said "majority opinion, in a moment of base passion which was only a peak wave in a storm of passion for individual personal aggrandizement, has sanctioned injustice." And it is only as these passions are swallowed up in the passion for integrity (wholeness), equality and human dignity, that re-appraisal of the evidence is not only possible but imperative.

It is the imperatives we have forgotten and must re-discover at the center of our lives. These imperatives were once attributed to a thing we called the conscience. Fred Cook, who re-examines the Hiss Case in *The Nation*, uses the word in his concluding sentence. Hinting that there may have been US Government collaboration in the framing of Hiss by Chambers, Cook says that while the ultimate issue of Hiss's guilt or innocence remains in doubt "conscience cannot rest." William A. Reuben's "The Honorable Mr. Nixon" should be studied in this connection. Conscience is an irresistible passion for integrity.

Many thanks for renewals and expressions of interest. We are happy to welcome to our Board of Editorial Advisers the Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, pastor of the First Unitarian Church in Los Angeles, one of America's most influential leaders in the cause of cultural and economic progress, peace and freedom.

NEW CHRISTIAN

SEPT.-OCT. 1957

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I. Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etianne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**